



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,863	08/20/2003	Kazumi Koike	8012-1206	5197
466	7590	12/16/2004	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			BLACKMAN, ROCHELLE ANN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2851	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,863

Applicant(s)

KOIKE, KAZUMI

Examiner

Rochelle Blackman

Art Unit

2851

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 6 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/20/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-8 in the reply filed on November 4, 2004 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: on ^{line 5} 4 of claims 3 and 4, "Wherein" should be - -wherein- -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (JP Patent No. 07-064178) in view of Kamata (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0057907).

Sato discloses a lens-fitted photo film unit (see Drawings 1-15) comprising: a taking lens (7); a plane mirror (8) for perpendicularly bending a photographic optical path of subject light passing through said taking lens; and a photo film (see 4-6) disposed approximately in parallel with an optical axis of said taking lens, said photo

Art Unit: 2851

film having a base surface and an emulsion surface (although not specifically shown, the "film" of cartridge 5 is considered to have a base and emulsion surface), said subject light forming an image (image is formed on film through opening 4) on said emulsion surface.

Sato does not appear to disclose "a side print being recorded as a latent image on the edge of said photo film in such a manner as to flip vertically or horizontally in view of the side of said base surface".

Kamata teaches providing a side print (46, 47) being recorded as a latent image on the edge of a photo film (23) in such a manner as to flip vertically or horizontally in view of the side of said base surface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to provide a "a side print being recorded as a latent image on the edge of said photo film in such a manner as to flip vertically or horizontally in view of the side of said base surface" in the "lens-fitted photo film unit" of the Sato reference, as taught by Kamata in order to permit producing tele-converted photographic prints at a low cost automatically without the need for any complicated operation or expensive structures (see pg. 1, paragraph [0010]).

2. Claims 2 and 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (JP Patent No. 07-064178) in view of Kamata (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0057907) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Abe (U.S. Patent No. 6,388,738).

Sato and Kamata disclose the claimed invention except for “wherein said viewfinder comprises: an objective lens element with negative refractive power; a first eyepiece lens element; and a second eyepiece lens element; and wherein said viewfinder satisfies the following formula: $P1 > |P2|$ Wherein P1 is the refractive power of said first eyepiece lens element, and P2 is the refractive power of said second eyepiece lens element”.

Abe teaches providing a viewfinder comprising: an objective lens element with negative refractive power (23); a first eyepiece lens element (25); and a second eyepiece lens element (26); and wherein said viewfinder satisfies the following formula: $P1 > |P2|$ Wherein P1 is the refractive power of said first eyepiece lens element (see 25 – considered to satisfy the “formula” because it is a biconvex lens), and P2 is the refractive power of said second eyepiece lens element (see 26 - also considered to satisfy the “formula” because it is a planoconvex lens).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to provide the “viewfinder” of the “lens-fitted photo film unit” of the combined Sato and Kamata reference with a “objective lens element”, “first eyepiece lens element”, and “second eyepiece lens element” like that of the Abe reference, in order to provide a viewfinder through which a bright and clear field frame image can be viewed and reduce the thickness of the filed frame optical system (see col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 6).

3. Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (JP Patent No. 07-064178) in view of Kamata (U.S. Patent Application

Art Unit: 2851

Publication No. 2002/0057907) and Abe (U.S. Patent No. 6,388,738) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Tobiyo et al. (JP Patent No. 09-197490).

Sato, Kamata, and Abe disclose the claimed invention except for “a target mark formed in the pupil side surface of said first eyepiece lens element; and a micro lens disposed in the pupil side surface of said second eyepiece lens element; wherein said target mark enlarged by said micro lens appears in the field of view of said viewfinder; wherein said target mark is in a ring-shape form and in approximately the center of the pupil side surface of said second eyepiece lens element”.

Tobiyo teaches providing a “target mark” (40a, 60a, 65a, 67a) integrally formed on an eyepiece side of lens 40; and a “micro lens” (41a) integrally formed on the eyepiece side of the eyepiece 41; “wherein said target mark enlarged by said micro lens appears in the field of view of said viewfinder”(see 51, 61, 66, and 68 of Drawings 5, 9, 11, and 13); “wherein said target mark is in a ring-shape form” (see shape of 40a and 60a) and “in approximately the center of the pupil side surface” of lens 40.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a “target mark” on “pupil side surface” of the “first lens element” with a “target mark” and dispose a “micro lens” in the “pupil side surface” of the “second lens element” of the “viewfinder” of the combined Sato, Kamata, and Abe reference, as taught by Tobiyo in order to obtain commendable photographing distance capable of holding an entire image inside a photographing range (see abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 4, 6, and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

2. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 4 is has been found to be allowable because the prior art of record either alone or in combination neither discloses nor makes obvious the particular feature, "said viewfinder satisfies the following formula: $W > 26$ Wherein W is the width of said viewfinder" in combination with the particular combination of features recited in claims 1 and 2.

Claim 6 has been found to be allowable because the prior art of record either alone or in combination neither discloses nor makes obvious the particular feature, "said viewfinder satisfies the following formula: $0.2 < L/W < 0.7$ wherein L is the length between the pupil side surface of said objective lens element and the objective side surface of said first eyepiece lens element" in combination with the particular combination of features recited in claims 1, 2, and 5.

Claim 8 has been found to be allowable because the prior art of record either alone or in combination neither discloses nor makes obvious the particular feature, "said viewfinder is movable between an unused position and a used position, and when said viewfinder is in said unused position, said viewfinder is disposed at the rear of said flash projector so that the field of view of said viewfinder is obstructed by said flash projector,

Art Unit: 2851

and when said viewfinder is in said used position, said viewfinder pops up from the rear of said flash projector so that said flash projector retracts from the field of view of said viewfinder" in combination with the particular combination of features recited in claims 1 and 2.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rochelle Blackman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2113. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RB


JUDY NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER